DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 480 95 SO 010 994

AUTHOR Broudy, Harry S.
TITLE Moral/Citizenship Education: Potentials and Limitations. Occasional Paper No. 3.
INSTITUTION Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 77
CONTRACT 400-76-0043
NOTE 15p.
AVAILABLE FROM Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1700 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 ($1.00 paperbound)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Changing Attitudes; *Citizenship; Civics; Curriculum Development; Educational Assessment; Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; *Educational Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; Individual Development; *Moral Development; Problem Solving; *Program Descriptions; Public Opinion; Social Change; Values

ABSTRACT

The paper presents an overview of moral/citizenship education (MCE) in public schools and suggests alternative approaches to MCE. The paper is presented in five major sections. Section I explains that MCE comprises moral education, moral training, citizenship education, and citizenship training. The author hypothesizes that current interest in MCE is an aftermath of Watergate and counterculture activism in the 1960s. Section II outlines conditions governing MCE programs in public schools. Limitations to program development include heterogeneity of values and life styles, discrepancy between classroom teaching and informal learning, and discrepancy between educational objectives and community-accepted behavior. Section III suggests conditions which would make MCE programs acceptable in the community and in educational circles. For an MCE program to be generally acceptable, it should include a minimum of arbitrary content, practice in moral problem-solving, and instruction about values. Section IV explains how to develop and evaluate MCE curriculum. The final section briefly considers two other approaches to MCE. The first approach combines elements of values clarification, moral decision-making, and group interaction; the second approach encourages each school to select the program that best meets its educational and community needs. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED160480

MORAL/CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: POTENTIALS AND LIMITATIONS

OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 3

Harry S. Broudy
University of Illinois

PLANNING FOR MORAL/CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION
RUSSELL A. HILL, Director
JOAN D. WALLACE, Editor

WINTER - 1977

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC.
SUITE 1700/1700 MARKET STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ulrik Rouk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

SO 010 994

Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education is funded by the National Institute of Education (NIE).

Published by RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC., a private non-profit corporation. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract 400-76-0043 with the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Educational and Welfare.

Foreword

Dr. Harry S. Broudy -- noted educator, scholar, historian, and philosopher -- in this paper turns a realistic and analytic eye on contemporary moral/citizenship education (MCE): the conditions limiting program possibilities; the conditions facilitating consensus regarding programs; considerations of curriculum development, research, and evaluation; and other approaches to MCE. His scrutiny, grounded on the "real world" of education and educators, provides insight and direction to those who must grapple with the hard realities of MCE programs, programming, and acceptance.

Dr. Broudy brings to his topic wide-ranging knowledge and experience. He received the Ph.D. degree from Harvard University and is currently professor of philosophy of education, emeritus, at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign campus. He has written extensively in philosophy of education and aesthetic education; his books include: Building a Philosophy of Education, Enlightened Cherishing, and The Real World of the Public Schools.

The dissemination of Dr. Broudy's paper is an outgrowth of a national program, Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education. The program, carried out by Research for Better Schools, was funded largely by the National Institute of Education. Aside from promoting informational activities, as represented by this paper, the planning program had as its major objective the development of MCE R, D, and D recommendations.

MORAL/CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: POTENTIALS AND LIMITATIONS

Harry S. Broudy
University of Illinois

It seems fair to say that the current press for moral/citizenship education in the public schools is a phase of the aftermath to Watergate and the counterculture rebellion of the last decade. Polls consistently report the public's distress with lack of respect for authority and the prevalence of violence and vandalism in schools. General permissiveness is often blamed for this. The low esteem in which establishment figures are held is attributed to a dacay in moral standards -- all of which the schools are expected to remedy or mitigate by providing moral education/training. The emphasis of the Bicentennial rhetoric on moral principles also has stimulated the interest in moral/citizenship education.

I shall not comment on the soundness of these assumptions or the inferences drawn from them. However, in responding to them it is advisable to keep in mind the tendency to overestimate the power of the school and to underestimate the non-school factors in the manners and morals of a people. Moreover, in formulating policy in this field much can be learned from the instructional and social conditions under which some schools carry on moral or character training successfully. It is pertinent to ask of any proposed program whether these conditions obtain or can be made to obtain in a public school system.

Some of the difficulties arise from the differences between "moral education," "moral training," citizenship education," and "citizenship training." The term "moral" technically refers to choices and their justification. It connotes a freedom of agents to choose on the basis of principles that define the good and the right; it also places upon them the duty of con-

sidering the consequences of their choices for themselves and for others. It is, in short, a cognitive process of evaluating diverse preferences, desires, and circumstances -- what have been called "valuings."

Citizenship education, accordingly, refers to instruction on a subset of choices involving the duties of the citizen regarding measures and procedures affecting the common good, the discharge of one's civic responsibilities, and the exercise of one's civic rights.

Both moral training and citizenship training carry the connotation of semi-automatic behavioral and attitudinal responses toward classes of situations. Training stresses the right valuings, right being defined by the customs and expectations of the group, whereas education stresses the right evaluings, right being defined by the rules and principles of moral reasoning. Thus parents want children to <u>want</u> to be clean, honest, and respectful in a standard set of situations without necessarily "thinking" about it; in their bones they know that right thinking will bear out the right feelings.

Character education and training are similarly differentiated, but "character" refers to a steady tendency or set of dispositions, so that it is proper to speak of good, bad, and strong character -- the goodness or badness depending on the tendencies that have been made more or less habitual or characteristic, whereas strength is judged by the reliability of the response.

Conditions Limiting Program Possibilities

Any program of moral/citizenship education or training in the public schools is likely to face:

1. heterogeneity of value commitments, life styles, and moral norms; this diversity is to be found not only in the various constituencies of the

schools but also in the theories, approaches, materials, and methods that obtain in the educational community.

2. a discrepancy between the pedagogical strategy and tactics needed for instruction in knowledge about values, character, conduct, and moral reasoning, on the one hand, and the formation of habits and attitudes, on the other.
3. a discrepancy between the professed ideals of the community as enunciated in the objectives of the school and the tolerated behavior in the community.

These conditions virtually rule out:

1. programs that advocate a particular political or economic ideology, philosophical orientation, theory of personality/personality development, and religious doctrine or values hierarchy, except in highly homogeneous communities.
2. programs defined by a set of generic character traits, e.g., honesty, respect for authority, responsibility, etc., because
   a. if they are stated in terms general enough to secure broad consensus, they may mask highly differentiated behaviors on which there is far less consensus.
   b. if they are not translated into behaviors and taught as such, there is the possibility that the learnings will remain at the verbal stage.
3. programs confined to a set of cognitive procedures, e.g., solving moral dilemmas, moral reasoning, study of ethics, etc., because

a. cognitive competence does not necessarily change habits and attitudes, and the program will be unsatisfactory to those who look to it for more or less automatic adherence to certain codes of conduct.

b. the cognitive approach risks criticism by the pupil of moral principles, codes, and political behavior that are tolerated in the community, and this may antagonize the most vigorous proponents of a program of "moral education."

4. programs concentrating on training for the observance of the mores of the community because

a. if the community really is of one mind on the mores to be observed, the school will automatically reinforce them, and no special program may be needed.

b. the conditioning of the young to a particular set of values, behaviors, or code of conduct is incompatible with the type of moral reflection thought to be essential to morality.

Conditions for Possible Consensus

A program that might achieve consensus among the various constituencies in the community and in educational circles would have to have a minimum of arbitrary content and a process to which there would be a minimum of resistance. A program that would meet these conditions would have two strands:

1. practice in moral problem-solving, using

social and personal values conflicts as
targets for instruction.

The Dewey Complete Act of Thought is still the most familiar formula for such deliberation. It formulates an hypothetico-deductive style of reasoning that moves from a felt predicament through transformation of the predicament into a problem, using generalizations to frame hypotheses, conjecturing the consequences of these hypotheses, constructing a test for the preferred hypothesis, and finally to conducting the test. Values conflicts lend themselves to this style of thinking, as do predicaments of blocked action, discontinuity in knowledge, and the like. The paradigm is used in many project curricula, especially in the social studies. It can be made to incorporate the special categories of moral reasoning and the self-probing urged in values-clarification techniques as subordinate processes. (Raup, Benne, Axtelle, & Smith, 1943, is worth consulting as an attempt to amend the Dewey paradigm to take account of some of the noncognitive factors that underlie values conflicts.)

The moral problem-solving approach has the advantage of being part and parcel of the ideal democratic process, and it is difficult for those committed to that process to object to educating the young in its use. Furthermore, the hypothetico-deductive method has logical criteria that are not class-bound, and in that sense it commands the allegiance of all who are committed to rationality in general and to a rational approach to morals in particular.

Nevertheless, the problem-solving method is not completely general; it does deal with particular problems and with generalizations and information that are about particular items of experience. In other words, the content and the concepts with which the problem-solving process is carried on must also be

legitimated by a nonpartisan authority. This authority is provided by the canons of scholarship governing the contents of the disciplines, scientific and humanistic. This is the second strand of the program:

2. knowledge about values.
   Each values domain (economic, health, civic, associational, intellectual, moral, aesthetic, religious) has
   a. an intrinsic, phenomenological aspect, i.e., what it feels like to have an obligation, an aesthetic experience, etc.
   b. an extrinsic phase, its facilitation or inhibition of realizing values in all the other domains (cf. Broudy, 1961, Part II, for a detailed analysis of the values domains).

Systematic graded study of the values domains is quite feasible; the materials available in the disciplines are virtually without limit. The intrinsic phase of values experience is developed in the individual in many forms of direct experience, but the arts, including literature and drama, are among the most potent vicarious ways of increasing the range and sensitivity of the individual to the various modes of valuing.

When knowledge about values as here described is used in the process of moral problem-solving, it should eventuate in what might be called enlightened valuing, enlightened evaluing (morality), and enlightened citizenship.

A program constructed out of these two strands should achieve a broad consensus for the reasons already mentioned, namely, its lack of arbitrariness. This should enable the program to meet the difficulty of heterogeneity discussed above.

Moreover, it could achieve a number of the objectives commonly cited for moral/citizenship education: stimulation of values thinking, increase of sensitivity to moral issues, improvement in the skills of moral deliberation, and ability to examine community mores rationally and critically.

Such a program would reinforce favorable attitudes toward moral problem-solving, rationality, and moral responsibility; indeed, it would shape attitudes in favor of the professed ideals of the community. But it might not change the attitudes of pupils or their behavior in moral situations as much as some of the proponents of moral/citizenship education might like. This is a limitation of the proposed program, but the number of nonschool variables that affect the life outcomes of schooling is so great that one hesitates to promise what in the nature of social dynamics it cannot give -- except under very special circumstances. I refer, of course, to private schools that sequester the pupil for long periods in an environment over which the school has almost complete control.

Curriculum Development, Research, and Evaluation

Much of the information and conceptual resources needed by the program sketched above already exists. There is a highly developed body of literature on moral philosophy, moral reasoning, and social philosophy, as well as on personality development, problem-solving, and decision-making. Selection rather than creation is the primary task:

1. selection of the problems for study at various grade levels.
2. selection of materials from the disciplines that bear on the examination and understanding of the values domains geared to grade levels.

Curriculum designers have at least two options. One is to construct a values or moral-education curriculum to run parallel to the existing curriculum in skills and subject matter; the other is to make the moral problem-solving via the concepts and categories of the arts and sciences the major part of the curriculum, with the training in symbolic skills as the means of utilizing it.

Pedagogically, the proposed program requires three types of teaching: didactic, to impart skills and knowledge; heuristic, to help the pupil carry through the thought processes involved in deliberation; and philetic, to establish the psychological rapport between pupils and teacher that permits the clarification of attitudes toward personal and societal problems (Broudy, 1974).

Evaluation would consist of periodic judgments on:

1. willingness and adeptness of the pupil to undertake moral problem-solving.
2. intellectual quality of the generalizations and reasoning used in the process.

The evaluation would not demand a judgment on the changes in the behavior of either the pupil or the community, inasmuch as such behavior is the resultant of many variables other than and in addition to moral problem-solving.

Other Approaches

This paper has not considered other possible approaches to the problem of moral/citizenship education. Of these, the most obvious is the eclectic one, that is, combining more or less on an ad hoc basis elements of values clarification, moral decision-making, group interaction, role-playing, participation in school governance, and others. The eclectic approach requires no systematic discussion; it needs, instead, a variety of

resources and freedom for the school or the individual teacher to move from one activity to another.

The same comment can be made about the alternatives approach in which some schools use program A while others may choose B or C or N. This approach is especially helpful when the goals and outcomes of the enterprise are indeterminate and in controversy. Groups at odds with each other need not achieve agreement; each can go its own way. Finally, "alternatives" has the honorific meaning of freedom for each group to do "its own thing." At a time when pluralism is in vogue, this is an especially attractive solution.

References

Broudy, H. Building a philosophy of education (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961.

Broudy, H. Three modes of teaching and their evaluation. In The evaluation of teaching. National Symposium for Professors of Educational Research. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1974.

Raup, R. B., Beene, K., Axtelle, G., & Smith, B. O. The improvement of practical intelligence. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.

RBS POSITION AND RESEARCH PAPERS ON MORAL/CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Bell, T.H. Morality and citizenship education: Whose responsibility? Occasional Paper No. 1, 1976.

Broudy, H.S. Moral/ citizenship education: Potentials and limitations. Occasional Paper No.3 1977

Fenton, E. The relationship of citizenship education to values education. Occasional Paper No. 2, 1977.

Hill, R.A. Ethical/Moral Action Instructional Program. Position Paper No. 1, 1975.

Hill, R.A., Wallace J. Newcombe, E., & Young,J. REsearch studies reporting experimental effects in the moral/ethical/values domain: An Annotated bibliography, 1977.

Hill, R.A.., & Wallace, J. Report on the National Conference on Planning for Moral/Citizenship Education, 1976.

Hill, R.A., & Wallace, J. Recommendations for a R, D, and D agenda in ethical-citizenship education, 1976.

Klafter, M., & Wallace, J. A bibliography on moral/values education, 1976.

Sanders, N.M. Plans for the field test of the Ethical/ Moral Action Instructional Program. Position Paper No. 2, 1975.

Sanders N.M., & Klafter, M. The importance and desired characteristics of moral/ ethical education in the public schools: A systematic analysis of recent document, 1975.

Sanders, N.M., & Wallace, J. Teacher and parent opinion concerning moral/ethical education in the public schools: A report of an Institute for Survey Research study, 1975.

STATMENT OF PURPOSE

PLANNING FOR MORAL/CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION is based on three assumptions: the need for and interest in moral/citizenship education are increasingly expressed in many segments of our society; the field is rich with diverse activities, theories, research, and promising directions to explore; a national coordinating effort is necessary to draw together this diversity and establish common ground and guidelines for future work across the field. To this end, the initial objectives of the planning program include: coordinating activities, sharing knowledge, identifying issues, convening informational planning conferences, examining managerial techniques, analyzing programmatic approaches, and preparing planning recommendations. An Advisory Group and Resource Panel will assist in shaping the planning program.

ADVISORY GROUP

Monsignor Francis X. Barret
Executive Secretary
Department of Chief Administrators of
Catholic Education
National Council Education Association

Ms. Vivian Bowser
Executive Committee
National Education Association

Gordon Cawelti
Executive Director
Association for Supervision and
Curriculum Development

J. Blaine Fister
Director
Public Education Concerns
National Council of Churches of Christ
in the U.S.A.

Ms. Carol Kimmel
President
National Congress of Parents and Teachers

Karl Massanari
Associate Director
American Association of Colleges for
Teacher Education

William J. Russell
Executive Officer
American Educational Research Association

Ira Silverman
Director
Institute for Jewish Policy Planning and
Research
Synagogue Council of America

Ms. Carolyn Warner
Chief State School Officer, Arizona
Council of Chief State School Officers

Harold H. Viehman
Director
Ministry in Public Education

RESOURCE PANEL

Harry S. Broudy
University of Illinois

Jerrold Coombs
University of British Columbia

Howard Kirschenbaum
National Humanistic Education Center

Lawrence Kolberg
Harvard University

Louis Rubin
University of Illinois

Norman Sprinthall
University of Minnesota

Ervin Staub
University of Massachusetts

Ralph Tyler
Science Research Associates